


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES EQUAL)	
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY)	
COMMISSION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 1:17cv1084 (AJT/JFA)
)	
v.)	
)	
CAMBER CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

It appearing to the court that the parties have reached an agreement resolving all disputes presented in this action, it is ordered that all litigation activity in this matter is stayed until June 22, 2018, and the hearing on the pending motion for summary judgment scheduled for June 15, 2018 and the jury trial scheduled for July 9, 2018 are cancelled. If a Consent Decree has not been filed with the court by June 21, 2018, counsel for the parties shall appear for a status conference before the undersigned on Friday, June 22, 2018, at 10:00 a.m.

Entered this 1st day of June, 2018.


_____/s/_____
John F. Anderson
United States Magistrate Judge
John F. Anderson
United States Magistrate Judge

Alexandria, Virginia

the Court's decision in *United States v. Jones*, 135 S. Ct. 1069 (2015), which held that the government's installation of a GPS tracking device on a vehicle without a warrant violated the Fourth Amendment.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is significant because it reaffirmed the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle. This principle is central to the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable searches and seizures.

The Court's decision in *Jones* also clarified the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable. The Court held that a search is reasonable if it is based on probable cause and if the government has a legitimate interest in the information it is seeking.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.

The Court's decision in *Jones* is a landmark case that will have a lasting impact on the Fourth Amendment. It reaffirms the principle that the government must obtain a warrant before installing a GPS tracking device on a vehicle, and it clarifies the standard for determining whether a search is reasonable.